

**REMARKS**

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

Claim 4 has been withdrawn and claims 1 and 5-13 have been cancelled. Amended claims 2 and 3, and new claims 14-42 are in the application.

Claims 2-3, 6, and 8-9 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations in the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations in base claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that independent claim 2, along with claim 3 dependent therefrom, are allowable. Claims 6 and 8-9 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 5, 7, and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kasser.

As previously indicated, claims 1, 5, 7, and 10-13 have been canceled. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 14-42 are distinguishable over Kasser as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter, merely "Kasser"). For example, it is respectfully submitted that Kasser does not disclose "wherein said first intermediate signal lies along a signal path separate from a signal path of an extraction of a stereo-sum signal from the incoming multiplex signal" as in independent claim 14: "wherein said obtaining of said first intermediate signal is separate from said extracting of said stereo-sum signal" as in independent claim 15; "coherently demodulating


said multiplex signal employing a second harmonic of a pilot carrier of said multiplex signal so as to obtain a first intermediate signal” as in independent claim 28; “wherein said means for obtaining said first intermediate signal is separate from said means for extracting said stereo-sum signal” as in independent claim 34; and “first means configured and adapted for coherently demodulating said multiplex signal employing a second harmonic of a pilot carrier of said multiplex signal so as to obtain a first intermediate signal” as in independent claim 36.

The Examiner made of record, but did not rely upon, a number of documents. The applicant appreciates the Examiner’s explicit finding that these documents, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.

In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference, there is the bases for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:   
Dennis M. Smid  
Reg. No. 34,930  
(212) 588-0800